

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

',"		STORES OF	Address : COMMISS Washingt	SIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEM ion, D.C. 20231	IARKS
SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FI	RST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOC	KET NO.
047627 ₇ 980 07	7/05/84	MIYASAKA		T 55153P	
F. OBOX 747	IDNGTON ST		,	EXAMINER LECON - IS ART UNIT PAPER NU	MBER
FALLS CHURCH:	-VA 2204a-	W7 112		122 DATE MAILED: 1)5/31/85	4
This is a communication	on from the examina	er in charge of your app	dication.		
COM	IMISSIONER OF P	ATENTS AND TRADE	MARKS		
This application has been exa A shortened statutory period for re Failure to respond within the perio	esponse to this action	on is set to expire	3_month(s),		
Part I Notice of References Notice of Art Cited by Information on How to	Cited by Examiner, Applicant, PTO-14	49	2. Notice re Patent	t Drawing, PTO-948. al Patent Application, Form PTO-152	•
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION	(
1. Claims	22	· -		are pending in the application	on.
Of the above, o	taims	18-22		are withdrawn from considera	ation.
2. Claims				have been cancelled.	
3. Claims				are allowed.	
4. Claims /-/	7			are rejected.	
			•	are objected to.	
6. Claims			are su	ubject to restriction or election requirem	ent.
7. This application has to matter is indicated.	wen filed with infor	mal drawings which are	acceptable for examination	purposes until such time as allowable	subject
8. Allowable subject mat	ter having been ind	icated, formal drawings	are required in response to	this Office action.	
9. The corrected or subs		e been received on	Th	ese drawings are acceptable;	
			ditional or substitute sheet d by the examiner (see expl	(s) of drawings, filed onanation).	
the Patent and Trader	mark Office no longe is <u>MUST</u> be effected	er makes drawing chang I in accordance with the	es. It is now applicant's re	indisapproved (see explanation). Hesponsibility to ensure that the drawings the attached letter "INFORMATION ON	s are
12. Acknowledgment is m	ade of the claim for	priority under 35 U.S.C	2.119. The certified copy t	nas 🔏 been received 🔲 not been re	ceived
been filed in pare			; filed on		·
		ondition for allowance or orte Quayle, 1935 C.D.		osecution as to the merits is closed in	
14. [] Other					

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-17, drawn to compounds,
 classified in Classes 544; 546, subclasses 60, 125, 361;
 48. If elected applicants must elect a single
 disclosed species, as required under 35 USC 121.
- II. Claims 18-22, drawn to processes of preparing the instantly claimed compounds, classified in Classes 544; 546, subclasses 60, 125, 361; 48.

The inventions are separate and distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions group II and group I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process such as one of the two separate and distinct processes instantly claimed or by one of the processes taught by Miyasaka et al '695.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Stewart on April 25, 1985 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, example 5 the elected specie, claims 1-17. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in responding to this Office action.

Claims 18-22 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12, 13, 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

The following reasons apply:

o(cl. The specification is enabling for a portion of the subject matter claimed but the specification is not commensurate in scope with the claims where R²/R³ or NR⁸R⁹ are a "heterocyclic group.... interrupted with O, S and/or N". Do applicants also intend thiazole, oxazole,

quinoline, pyrazine, imidazole, etc? Those groups and more are embraced.

- 2. The term "heterocyclic group" and "carbocyclic group" are indefinite as to the number of carbon atoms.

 Are mono-cyclic, bicyclic, tricycliic, etc. intended?
 - 3. The term "substituted" is non-limiting as to the number of substituents intended.

Claims 6 and 15 are unclear as to what is intended by $[N-R^8-N(R^8R^9-amino) C_{1-4}alky1]$; and $[N-C_{1-4}alky1-N(R^8R^9-amino) C_{1-4}alky1]$, respectively.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Miyasaka et al '256.

Miyasaka et al '256 describes compounds structurally similar to the instantly claimed compounds. The reference teaches substitution at the 10-position by an acyloxy Amoiety derived from aromatic carboxylic acids, heterocyclic carboxylic acids, alkyl, and aromatic sulfonic acids, etc. page 7.

The instantly claimed compounds would be obvious in view of the teaching of Miyasaka et al '256.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Miyasaka et al '692, '282' '276, '770, '642, Japan Patent '583, Sugasawa '098 and Winterfeldt et al '029, Japan Patents '289 and '584.

Applicants are requested to provide copies of the prior art cited in the specification.

(Gibson:bik

A/C 703

557-3920

5/2/85

ROBERT GERSTL PRIMARY EXAMINATION ART UNIT